

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6-8, 10 and 12 are pending. The amendments to Claims 1 and 8 are supported in the originally filed specification as follows: p.7, lines 6-14. The amendment to Claim 12 is supported by Claim 8. No new matter is added.

Claim 12 is recited “the liquid supply method according to claim 8...” There are no method steps recited in claim 8. It is suggested that the recitation of claim 12, read—The liquid supply apparatus according to claim 8...” (Office Action, page 2).

Claim 12 is amended as suggested by the Examiner making the rejection moot.

Claims 1, 6-8, and 10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ota et al. (JP 2000208471) in view of Laverdiere (US PG Pub. 20050173003) further in view of Baker (3410531). (Office Action, page 3).

The claimed invention now recites in part:

the supply liquid circulation tube is made from a material selected from the group consisting of fluorine resin, polyolefin resin, silicone based resins, polyethylene based resins, polypropylene based resins and poly(4-methylpentene-1) based resins.

Ota and Baker nowhere disclose liquid circulation tube materials. Laverdiere discloses the following related to a disclosed valve:

[0114] The valve functions by applying pneumatic pressure between the fluid diaphragm 401 and the pneumatic diaphragm 402 to drive the valve open against a pre-loaded compression spring 800 biasing the valve closed. Because the pneumatic diaphragm 402 is larger than the fluid diaphragm 401 and the two diaphragms are constrained to each other with screw 403 and button 404, the pressure will create a greater load on the pneumatic diaphragm 402 and force the valve open. Pressure is supplied through barb fitting 405 (FIG. 25B) and tubing (e.g., polyethylene) 406. The pneumatic pressure cavity 410 is sealed with O-ring 407 and pneumatic diaphragm tongue and groove as shown. A sensor 411 sealed with O-ring 412 and secured with a sensor cap 413.

However, Laverdiere does not disclose a material of liquid circulation tubes. Simply put, without more, the combination of Ota, Laverdiere and Baker cannot logically make obvious the invention now claimed.

Without a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness established, the rejection must fail. Nowhere is this method and apparatus disclosed or taught in the combination of cited art. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1, 6-8 and 10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ota et al. (JP 200208471) in view of Kumano et al. (US PG Pub. 20060144777) further in view of Baker (3410531). (Office Action, page 4).

Ota, Kumano and Baker nowhere disclose liquid circulation tube materials as now claimed. Kumano teaches cellulose triacetate as a material of the hollow fiber reverse osmosis membranes in Example 1, but does not disclose or teach the materials now claimed for liquid circulation tubes. Nowhere is the invention now claimed disclosed in the combination of the cited art. Without more, the invention cannot logically be obvious. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 04-1105.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 9, 2011

Customer No. 21874

Electronic signature: /James E. Armstrong, IV/
James E. Armstrong, IV
Registration No.: 42,266
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
(202) 478-7375
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant